Dear Jim, 2/28/76

While I would not want to give the impression that one experience with a small audience of blacks can be taken as typical my reception at the apparently all-black Detroit-area community college, Highland Park Community College, is one from which I do believe we can learn and perhaps project.

I had outlined what I planned to say. As usual it would have taken longer. So, about 45 minutes into it I concluded my opening remarks. I did not show any slides because Greg to not finish them. I had planned to use an opaque projector for some of the new documents but didn't get to that. Or, I said less than I had planned and used no visuals and the reception was great.

I can't evaluate the student body but I would be surprised if there is any area in which we could expect a higher percentage of radical thought and perspective. There was no question or issue I ducked in any way. I had felt it not unlikely that I might confront some honky attitude, perhaps some resentment when the questions and answers turned to black attitudes toward the King assassination and black abdication.

There was none. There also was not a single nutty or in any way irrespondible question. No baiting. No kinky stuff. If I had been black there could not have been a difference. As a matter of fact, I think that while it was smaller than most audiences I have had, apparently by college design, judging from the size of the room used, it was perhaps the best audience I have had. Not only because of the absence of the irresponsible or of racism in any manifestation either way but because of the maturity and responsibility of the reaction, not only in the questions asked. It was quite a gratification.

A fair percentage of the audience was older than the average syudent body today. There were several members of the faculty. In varying but all flattering ways all commented afterward. Including the one while, of the social sciences faculty. The Dean of Students offered to write a letter than might help me get other appearances. He also spoke to Floyd at some length after it was over, while students and others were coming up to me.

For this sampling of the student body they have have one hell of a fine faculty. Those I met certainly were. However, this can suggest the audience was atypical. The faculty/administration people I met were wonderful human beings. But the fact remains that in the Detroit area there should be as good a prospect of finding radical negativism as anywhere and there was none. And from this I dedice that from that spectrum there is not likely to be opposition to any reopening of the King assassination.

Floyd was euphoric after it was over. He said he would not have missed it for anything. Believe me, I ducked nothing and some of it was hard. It also drained me emotionally. I said what I believe, said it straightforwardly, and it was accepted and I think I was respected for it.

I think also that the outline, if too long, is the basis for the speech I can make on this subject. I think also that with a little luck and perhaps some help it can get me to areas where there are other things I can do. Like Atlanta. I'll not be surprised if there are some recommendations of this kind.

I was glad to get to the airport ahead of time. We sat and drank a little and relaxed much. In fact, a foul-up on the reservations had us returning first class!

On the way out I read and made notes on the interrogatories. Also returning. I'll pick that up after a walk, if there is no intrusion. I mean Wiseman's answer. My impression is that we can put the hat on him. Black hat. What I will do is type from where I left off as I wrote comments, then go back and type what I wrote, and do it with the possibility in mind that you may want it in affidavit form.

While I know you have some kind of affidavit in mind, I do not know what kind. I suggest that you consider having me lock horns with Wiseman on every possible "answer" and issue, ducking none but being exceedingly concerned about the position of the judge. These has several aspects. She has been burdened by FOIA work. Very heavily. She also is being imposed upon, I suspect not for the first time, by the FBI, DJ and USDA's office. This combination leads me to the belief that the inevitable result of the affidavit, regardless of its length or brevity, convince her that the FBI and friends are abusing her, not us. We instead prepare her, if she has the disposition, to go after them including the one before her, Dugan, for needlessly burdening her. I think this is easily possible. The one problem I anticipate is the proper phrasing, which I'll leave entirely to you.

However, I do think you should do the research, which I take it is simple, on the new tack I've spotted, in the invocation of FRCP 33 to accredit Wiseman and what is really meant by what I recall as (b)(7)(C) of the amended law. The first has to be trickery to attempt to make an incompetent affidavit appear competent and simultaneously avoid a perjury charge, the second some kind of cheap shot. (I refer to it differently in my indignant and challenging letter to Shea.) Regardless of what you do and do not do my letter to Shea eliminates the rational possibility they will attempt to use that kind of dodge and arms you if they are crazy or deparate enough to try now.

I am able to destroy this incredible document factually and am doing it. They have to be in real depparation. You called in incredible. I think that lacks the interpretation of motive. I also think you might want to consider this as a reading of their reading of their situation. I think also it would be very constructive if some representative of the Black Caucus, say Donovan Gay, were to be in the courtroom. I have a message from Donovan that he has and will return my files and that he is with the Black Caucus, no longer IW or Abzug. A little more, which interprets more or less as we have waht Abzug did to us. Lane did figure.

My interpretation is that the government is really worried about the potential of this one. With a live defendant, us the defense, a pending appeals decision and a fairly large number of black Congresspeople, they should be. We should help them be.

I'm addressing each of Wiseman's "answers." Probably with the remaining about half I also will. My purpose in this is to arm you to show the totality of the dishonesty, to show that it is not merely with an isolated answer of two. Among the advantages I can see for the immediate as distinguished from where it can be helpful, appeal is placing the responsibility for the burden on her on them. This happens, as I see it, to coincide with my rights.

The Jim Bishop 5/14/75 column you just returned is marked in two places that will show black on your copy. These address the FBI's way of informing other writers. The important one is deLoach. However, that SAICs do is also helpful in this part of the request.

Best,